

**Iowa Reading First:
External Evaluator Final Report
2004-2005**



**Prepared by
Psychology in Education Research Lab
Iowa State University
Arlene de la Mora
Gary D. Phye
Faith Lichoro
Bernice Dodor
Lanfen Li**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
 Overview of the Iowa Reading First Student Data Collection	
Web-Based Data Collection Center	5
Description of Reading Measures.....	5
Assessments by Grade Level, Reading First State Evaluation Schedule	6
Student Level Descriptors.....	7
Web-based Reports	7
Understanding Performance Benchmarks and their use for Reading First Schools	8
Understanding Greatest Gains and their use for Reading First Schools.....	9
Student Data Analysis Described	9
 Results of School and Student Reading Performance	
Analysis of Performance Benchmarks Met	10
Greatest Gains.....	11
Student Performance Results (all Students)	11
Students Scoring at Grade Level by Gender.....	13
Students with an Economic Advantage/Disadvantage Scoring at Grade Level	17
Students by Major Racial/Ethnic Groups	22
Students with and without Disabilities	31
Students with and without Limited English Proficiency	36
 Other Results	
Special Education Data by Grade	41
 Appendix A: Tables	
Table 5. Number and Percentage of Performance Benchmarks Met.....	43
Table 6. Number of Greatest Gains Achieved by School.....	44
Table 7. Number of Students Proficient in Reading (All Students; Table)	45
Table 8. Results for Students by Gender (Table).....	46
Table 9. Results for Students with and without Economic Disadvantage (Table)	47
Tables 10ab. Results for Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups (Tables)	48
Table 11. Results for Students with and without Disabilities (Table)	50
Table 12. Results for Students with and without Limited English Proficiency (Table).....	51
Table 13. Special Education Data.....	52
 References	 53

Executive Summary

Data Collection: Iowa Reading First Data Collection site was available for data entry in the fall between September 12, 2004 and November 12, 2004. In the spring, the data collection site was open for data collection between January 31, 2005 and May 1, 2005. Because schools that administer their ITBS in spring were not expected to receive their scores by May 1, 2005, the data collection for ITBS ended on May 31, 2005.

Performance Benchmarks: During the 2004-2005 school year, there were 28 performance benchmarks that schools could meet compared to 15 performance benchmarks possible during the 2003-2004 school year. The increase reflects 13 performance benchmarks possible on ITBS assessments (nine), first grade BRI assessments (two), and second grade Phonics assessments (two). The number of performance benchmarks met by schools ranged from 27 to 13 (see Table 4). Eight school buildings (15.38%) met between 25 and 27 performance benchmarks; 21 schools (40.38%) met between 20-24 performance benchmarks; and 23 schools (44.23%) met between 13-19 performance benchmarks.

In general, the majority (96.15% to 100%) of schools met their performance benchmarks in phonological awareness (i.e., rhyming, deletion, blending, segmentation, isolation and substitution) and phonics (graphemes and decoding) among their kindergarten and first grade students (see Table 4). The majority of schools also met their performance benchmarks in phonics (graphemes, 84.62% and decoding, 59.62%) among second grade students.

Students in first, second and third grade continue to need support with fluency. One third or less (17.31% - 32.69%) of the participating schools met their performance benchmarks in fluency. Although fluency continues to be an area that requires support, the percentage of schools meeting their benchmarks in fluency increased from last year (i.e., 2nd grade increased by 11.54%, 3rd grade increased by 9.31%). The percentage of schools making their performance benchmarks on BRI Comprehension also increased by 3% to 4% in 2nd and 3rd grades respectively.

With the exception of 3rd to 4th grade comparisons (27-36%) on ITBS Comprehension, the majority of schools did not meet their performance benchmarks on ITBS Comprehension and Vocabulary.

Greatest Gains: The criteria for determining which schools made the greatest gains were changed for the 2004-2005 year due to the addition of ITBS data. Scores from 3rd to 3rd, 4th to 4th, and 3rd to 4th grade comparisons on ITBS Comprehension and ITBS Vocabulary were used to determine whether school were identified as making the greatest gains. Seven schools achieved the greatest gains (see section on Greatest Gains for more complete information).

Student Performance: The percentage of students proficient in reading increased between fall and spring. Among 3rd grade students, there was no change in the percentage of students proficient on BRI fluency between fall and spring.

Examination of student performance among the student subgroups (i.e., gender, race, students *with* disabilities, and students *with* limited English proficiency) indicates that the achievement gaps were narrowed. Performance between boys and girls was somewhat similar. In BRI fluency, the achievement gap widened between girls and boys with girls making greater gains. The achievement gap was narrowed on all assessments except BRI fluency (BRI fluency achievement gap widened for both 2nd and 3rd graders) *with* an economic disadvantage among students *with* an economic disadvantage between fall and spring. The achievement gap was narrowed on all reading assessments by students *with* limited English proficiency, increasing the percentage of students proficient on all reading assessments between fall and spring. In addition, with the exception of BRI fluency (2nd and 3rd grades widened) and BRI comprehension (2nd grade widened), the achievement gap was narrowed on reading assessments administered by students *with* disabilities.

The achievement gap widened on several reading assessments among students from two of the four major racial/ethnic groups (i.e., African American, Asian, Hispanic, American Indian). In particular, the achievement gap widened for African-American (kindergarten PAT Blending; 1st grade PAT deletion; 2nd grade BRI fluency; and 3rd grade BRI comprehension) and American Indian (kindergarten PAT Blending; 2nd grade BRI fluency; 3rd grade BRI comprehension)

Overview of Iowa Reading First State Evaluation Student Data Collection

Web-based Data Collection Center

Central to the evaluation of the Iowa Reading First Program is the collection of student data. Reading First participants entered data on a secure (password-protected) web-based data collection center. To assist schools to navigate through the web site (e.g., data entry, running reports, charts), support is provided by the Iowa Department of Education and the external evaluator along with a user manual that is easy to follow. Training is provided as needed.

Student data is collected two times per year (fall and spring) aligned with the Data Collection Plan. Tests administered include the Phonological Awareness Test (PAT), Basic Reading Inventory (BRI), and Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS). A description of these tests is provided in the following section, *Description of Reading Measures*. The *Assessment by Grades Level, Reading First State Evaluation Schedule* indicates which tests are administered in the fall and spring by grade.

Sociodemographic data is also collected on each student. Sociodemographic data collected includes gender, students with/without disabilities, major race/ethnic categories, students with economic advantage/disadvantage, and students with/without English limited proficiency. In addition, specific information regarding special education status, referral for pre-referral services is also collected. These sociodemographic data allows tests scores to be disaggregated by these five subgroups.

Description of Reading Measures

Phonological Awareness Test (Phonological Awareness and Phonics)

The Phonological Awareness Test is a normed referenced test designed to assess phonological processing and phoneme-grapheme correspondence (Robertson & Salter, 1997). The following phonological processing subtests are administered to kindergarten and first grade students: rhyming, deletion, and blending. Some of the phonological processing subtests may not be appropriate for all five year olds; therefore, the following subtests are only administered to first graders: segmentation, isolation, and substitution.

The phonics subtests (graphemes and decoding) are administered to first graders in the fall and spring. For scoring purposes, students who are proficient in phonological processing and phoneme-grapheme correspondence are not re-tested during subsequent testing. A presumption is made that students whose scores indicate they are proficient in a particular subtest have mastered this skill and no longer require testing. Therefore, the number of students who pass in the fall are added to the number of student who passed in the spring.

Basic Reading Inventory (Reading Fluency and Comprehension)

To assess student achievement in reading fluency and comprehension, the Basic Reading Inventory (BRI) is administered to second and third graders in the fall and spring. The BRI is an informal reading assessment test comprised of a series of graded word lists and graded passages

that can be used to gain insight into these areas (Johns, 2001). Student scores reported reflect whether students were independent at their current grade level in fluency and comprehension.

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (ITBS)

The Iowa Tests of Basic Skills is an achievement battery of tests comprised of various subject areas that have been standardized within the same group of students (Hoover, H., Dunbar, S., Frisbie, D., Oberley, K., Bray, R., Naylor, J., Lewis, J., Ordman, V., & Qualls, A.L., 2003).

National and Iowa percentile rank scores are derived for each of the following reading subject areas: vocabulary, comprehension, and reading total. The vocabulary test is a measure of a students' reading vocabulary. The comprehension test assesses three main skills: Factual Understanding, Inference and Interpretation, and Analysis and Generalization. The reading total subtest assesses the extent of student's development in reading comprehension.

Students in the third and fourth grades are administered the ITBS once during the fall, winter, or spring of each school year. Districts/schools determine the time of the year it is administered in their respective districts/schools.

Assessments By Grade Level: Iowa Reading First Evaluation Schedule

The following table indicates the tests required in Fall and Spring by grade for Reading First State Evaluation purposes.

Table 1. Iowa Reading First Assessment Schedule

TEST	FALL					SPRING				
	K	1	2	3	4	K	1	2	3	4
Phonological Awareness Test										
Rhyming	X	X				X	X			
Deletion	X	X				X	X			
Blending	X	X				X	X			
Segmentation		X					X			
Isolation		X					X			
Substitution		X					X			
Phonics										
Graphemes		X	X				X			
Decoding		X	X				X			
BRI										
Fluency (Grade level passage)			X	X			X	X	X	
Comprehension (Grade level passage)			X	X			X	X	X	
ITBS										
Reading Total (NPR & IPR)				See Note					See Note	
Reading Comprehension (NPR & IPR)										
Vocabulary (NPR & IPR)										

Note: ITBS is required for 3rd and 4th graders; however it is only administered once per year. Schools determine when the ITBS is administered.

Student Level Descriptors

Scores on each of the assessments administered to students participating in the Iowa Reading First Initiative are converted to student level descriptors (e.g., at grade level, needs additional intervention, needs substantial intervention). Table 2 indicates the cut points on each of the reading assessments when scores are converted to the student level descriptors. In addition, these student level descriptors provide information regarding the instructional needs for planning classroom instruction and for developing quality intervention plans for children who are at risk for reading difficulty.

The goal of the Reading First Initiative is for all students to be at grade level in each of the reading subtests administered. These descriptors assist buildings, teachers, parents, and technical assistance providers a structured way of monitoring movement in student achievement in each of the five essential components (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension).

Table 2. Test Types and Student Levels

Test	At Grade Level	Needs Additional Intervention	Needs Substantial Intervention
Phonological Awareness Test (PAT)	26th percentile rank or above*	17th to 25th percentile rank*	16th percentile rank or below*
Basic Reading Inventory (BRI) <i>Fluency</i>	50th percentile rank or above	26th to 49th percentile rank	25th percentile rank or below
Basic Reading Inventory (BRI) <i>Reading Comprehension</i>	Independent Level: 0–1½ comprehension questions missed	Instructional Level: 2–4 comprehension questions missed	Frustration Level: 4½ or more comprehension questions missed
Iowa Test of Basic Skills <i>(For each subtest)</i>	41st percentile rank or above	20th to 40th percentile rank	19th percentile rank or below

Note: * Percentile ranks are calculated for each of the PAT subtests (6 phonological awareness and 2 phonics subtests)

Web-based Reports

Schools and districts have the ability to generate building/district level reports. Report options include the number and percentage of students at grade level (agl), in need of additional intervention (nai), and need substantial intervention (nsi) by test and by grade.

Results can be disaggregated by the five categories (i.e., gender, economic advantage/disadvantage, students with/without disabilities, student with/without limited English proficiency, major race/ethnic categories) identified in the federal Reading First funding requirements.

Buildings/districts also have chart options that include percentage of students proficient by test, trend lines of the percentage of students by time, percentage of students proficient by the disaggregated groups, and the percentage of students at or below proficiency by time. Both reports and charts can be generated and dropped into a manuscript or Word document.

Understanding Performance Benchmarks and their use for Reading First Schools

Purpose of performance benchmarks. For Reading First Schools, performance benchmarking is used to determine if there is a statistically significant increase in the proportion of students attaining proficiency and to determine a building's funding status.

How do we determine whether performance benchmarks have been met? Schools can meet their performance benchmarks in one of two ways. The first method involves a statistical comparison of the percentage of students proficient in the fall to the percentage of students proficient in the spring. The second method involves determining whether 75% (70% on Iowa Tests of Basic Skills) or more of the students were proficient in the spring.

The percentage of students proficient in the fall is statistically compared to the percentage of students proficient in the spring. Schools that achieve a statistically significant increase between fall and spring are coded as having met their performance benchmark. Comparisons are made by test and by grade.

When schools do not meet their performance benchmarks statistically, the second method of assessment is used. Schools with 75% or more of their students proficient in the spring are coded as having met their performance benchmark. This assessment is made by test and by grade. The second method is used because some schools will not be able to statistically increase the percentage of students proficient from fall to spring. In particular, *school size* and the *percentage of students proficient at baseline* may affect whether schools are able to increase the percentage of students proficient in the spring statistically. Sample size affects significance testing and smaller schools may have greater difficulty meeting their performance benchmark statistically (see "Sample size influences whether statistically significant differences are achieved"). Other schools will not be able to significantly increase the percentage of students proficient in the spring because they have a relatively large percentage of students who are proficient on their tests at baseline (e.g., fall). As a result these schools will make smaller gains in the spring making it impossible to achieve a statistically significant difference. However, the percentage of students proficient at these schools may be greater than the percentage of students proficient among some of the schools that achieved statistical significance.

Understanding Greatest Gains and their use for Reading First Schools

To identify schools that achieved the greatest gains in reading achievement during the 2004-2005 school year, ITBS Comprehension NPR and ITBS Vocabulary NPR student test scores (scores were calculated for grade 3 to 3, grade 4 to 4, and grade 3 to 4 comparisons; a total of 6 comparisons) were converted to student level descriptors (i.e., at grade level, needs additional intervention, needs substantial intervention, see Student Level Descriptors). The percentage of students at grade level in 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 in each of the test were calculated. Next, student scores were then calculated to obtain the difference in percentage of students proficient on comprehension and vocabulary between the two school years for each school. Descriptive statistical analyses were used to determine the mean and standard deviation of each test (i.e., comprehension, vocabulary)

Results for each school were analyzed by grade and test. Schools received a score of 1 for each grade (e.g. 3, 4, 3&4) and test they were successful in moving students at least one standard deviation at grade level. The highest overall total score that a school could receive was 6. The Iowa Department of Education made the decision that a school would need to have demonstrated significant student achievement on at least four of the six comparisons (see Table 3).

Table 3. Greatest gains score possible by test and by grade analyzed.

Assessment	2003-2004(Year1) to 2004-2005(Year2) Comparison		
	Grade 3 to 3	Grade 4 to 4	Grade 3 to 4*
ITBS Comprehension NPR	1	1	1
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	1	1	1

Note: * Only data from students present in both 3rd grade in Year1 and 4th grade in Year2 were used in the analysis

Student Data Analysis Described

On a yearly basis, the test data and demographic data are analyzed to determine progress made by schools to increase the percentage of students proficient in reading as well as narrowing the achievement gap between groups (e.g., students with disabilities versus students without disabilities).

Schools are evaluated to determine whether they were able to meet performance benchmarks on each test (by grade). Schools can meet performance benchmarks in one of two ways. The first method involves a statistical comparison of the percentage of students proficient in the fall to the percentage of students proficient in the spring. The second method involves determining whether 75% (70% for ITBS) or more of the students were proficient in the spring. (For more information see section on Performance Benchmarks Met).

Analysis was also conducted to determine which schools made the greatest gains in increasing the percentage of students proficient in each of the tests between Fall and Spring or between 2003-2004 (Year1) and 2004-2005 (Year2).

RESULTS OF SCHOOL AND STUDENT READING PERFORMANCE

School Performance Results (Fall, 2004 – Spring, 2005)

Analysis of Performance Benchmarks Met (See Tables 4,5)

During the 2004-2005 school year, there were 28 performance benchmarks that schools could meet compared to 15 performance benchmarks possible during the 2003-2004 school year. The increase reflects 13 performance benchmarks possible on ITBS assessments (nine), first grade BRI assessments (two), and second grade Phonics assessments (two). The number of performance benchmarks met by schools ranged from 27 to 13 (see Table 4). Eight school buildings (15.38%) met between 25 and 27 performance benchmarks; 21 schools (40.38%) met between 20-24 performance benchmarks; and 23 schools (44.23%) met between 13-19 performance benchmarks.

Table 4. Number of PB Met by Number of School Buildings

Number of Buildings	Number of PB Met	Number of Buildings	Number of PB Met
0	28/28	5	20/28
3	27/28	7	19/28
2	26/28	4	18/28
3	25/28	1	17/28
5	24/28	5	16/28
3	23/28	2	15/28
3	22/28	3	14/28
5	21/28	1	13/28

Comparisons of the percentage of students proficient in Fall, 2004 to the percentage of students proficient in Spring, 2005 indicate that the majority of schools were able to meet their performance benchmarks on their phonological awareness subscales (see Table 5). Among kindergarten students, 100%, 96.15%, and 98.08% of the schools met their performance benchmarks on PAT Rhyming, Deletion, and Blending respectively. With the exception of PAT Blending (96.15%), all of the schools (100%) met their performance benchmarks on PAT Rhyming, Deletion, Segmentation, Isolation, Substitution, Phonics Graphemes and Decoding for their 1st grade students.

Comparisons of 1st grade student performance in Fall, 2003-2004 (year1) and 1st grade student performance in 2004-2005 (Year2) on BRI Fluency and BRI Comprehension were made. Half of the schools (50%) and less than one-third of the schools (30.77%) of the schools met their performance benchmarks on Comprehension and Fluency respectively.

The majority of schools met their performance benchmarks on BRI comprehension. Among participating schools, 80.77% and 90.38% met their benchmarks for 2nd and 3rd grade students respectively on their at-grade-level BRI Comprehension. The percentage of schools meeting

their performance benchmarks dropped when comparing progress measured with BRI Fluency. Less than one third (32.69%) and less than one-fifth (17.31%) of schools met their performance benchmarks for 2nd and 3rd grades.

Comparisons of 2nd grade student performance in Fall, 2003-2004 (year1) and 2nd grade student performance in 2004-2005 (Year2) on Phonics Graphemes and Phonics Decoding were made (see Table 4). The majority of schools (84.62%) and more than half of the schools (59.62%) of the schools met their performance benchmarks on Graphemes and Decoding respectively.

Performance on ITBS Comprehension, Vocabulary, and Reading Total was also compared between 2003-2004 and 2004-2005 school years (see Table 5). Comparison was made between 3rd grade performance in year1 and 3rd grade performance in year2, 4th grade performance in year1 and 4th grade performance in year2, and 3rd grade performance in year1 and 4th grade performance in year2. When comparing 3rd to 4th grade performance, only students who were present in both years were included in the analysis. In comprehension, 44.23%, 55.77%, and 69.23% of the schools met their performance benchmarks for 3rd, 4th, and 3rd to 4th grade comparison respectively. In vocabulary, 53.85%, 50%, and 51.92% of the schools met their performance benchmarks for 3rd, 4th, and 3rd to 4th grade comparison respectively. In reading total skills, 46.15%, 55.77%, and 63.46% of the schools met their performance benchmarks for 3rd, 4th, and 3rd to 4th grade comparison respectively.

Greatest Gains (see Table 6)

Seven schools were identified as having made the greatest gains on at least four of six areas based the criteria defined by the Iowa Department of Education (see Greatest Gains Defined). Two schools, Clearfield Elementary and Wall Lake View Auburn Elementary achieved all six; one school, Ottumwa Wilson Elementary achieved five; and four schools, Albert City Truesdale Elementary, Davenport Buchanan Elementary, Des Moines Wallace, and Storm Lake-South Elementary achieved four of the six greatest gains (see Table 6).

Student Performance Results (Fall, 2004 – Spring, 2005)

Students Scoring At Grade Level/Proficiency (All Students; see Table 7)

PAT Rhyming. In the fall, 62% of kindergarten students and 81% of first grade students were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 89% of kindergarten students and 88% of first grade students were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 27% and 7% respectively.

PAT Deletion. In the fall, 48% of kindergarten students and 67% of first grade students were proficient in deletion. By spring, 80% of kindergarten students and 86% of first graders were proficient in deletion, an increase of 32% and 19% respectively.

PAT Blending. In the fall, 49% of kindergarten students and 72% of first grade students were proficient in blending. By spring, 83% of kindergarten students and 87% of first graders were proficient in blending, an increase of 34% and 15% respectively.

PAT Segmentation. In the fall, 84% of first grade students were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 95% of first graders were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 11%.

PAT Isolation. In the fall, 76% of first grade students were proficient in isolation. By spring, 93% of first graders were proficient in isolation, an increase of 17%.

PAT Substitution. In the fall, 67% of first grade students were proficient in substitution. By spring, 88% of first graders were proficient in substitution, an increase of 21%.

PAT Graphemes. In the fall, 67% of first grade students were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 89% of first graders were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 22%. In the spring, 78% of second grade students were proficient in graphemes.

PAT Decoding. In the fall, 59% of first grade students were proficient in decoding. By spring, 84% of first graders were proficient in decoding, an increase of 25%. In the spring, 72% of second grade students were proficient in decoding.

BRI Fluency. In the fall, 38% of second grade students and 39% of third grade students were proficient in fluency. By spring, 47% of second graders and 39% of third grade students were proficient in fluency, an increase of 9% and 0% respectively. In the spring, 47% of first grade students were proficient in fluency.

BRI Comprehension. In the fall, 23% of second grade students and 50% of third grade students were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 59% of second graders and 77% of third grade students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 36% and 27% respectively. In the spring, 56% of first grade students were proficient in comprehension.

ITBS Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 62% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 69% of the students were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 42% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 47% of the students were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 63% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 62% of the students were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 44% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 42% of the students were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 63% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 67% of the students were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 44% of the students were proficient. Among fourth graders, 45% of the students were proficient in their reading skills.

Students Scoring at Grade Level by Gender (see Table 8)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 59% of male and 65% female students were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 88% of male and 90% of female students were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 29% and 25% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 79% of male and 84% female students were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 86% of male and 89% of female students were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 7% and 5% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between kindergarten male and female students was 6% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 2%. The females still scored higher than the males.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between first grade male and female students was 5% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 3%. Female students scored higher than males.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 46% of male and 50% female students were proficient in deletion. By spring, 77% of male and 82% of female students were proficient in deletion, an increase of 31% and 32% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 66% of male and 68% female students were proficient in deletion. By spring, 85% of male and 87% of female students were proficient in deletion, an increase of 19% and 19% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between kindergarten male and female students was 4% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring. Female students increased their scores more than male students, leading to a wider achievement gap (5%) between the two groups.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade male and female students was 2% (with females scoring higher). While both male and female students made progress in the spring, the 2% achievement gap between male and female students proficient in deletion remained constant. Female students scored higher than the males.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 46% of male and 53% female students were proficient in blending. By spring, 80% of male and 86% of female students were proficient in blending, an increase of 34% and 33% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 69% of male and 76% female students were proficient in blending. By spring, 85% of male and 89% of female students were proficient in blending, an increase of 16% and 13% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between kindergarten male and female students was 7% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 6%. Female students scored higher than the males.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between first grade male and female students was 7% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 4%. Female students scored higher than males.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in the fall, 82% of male and 87% female students were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 94% of male and 96% of female students were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 12% and 9% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade male and female students was 5% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 2%. The females scored higher than the males.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in the fall, 72% of male and 80% female students were proficient in isolation. By spring, 92% of male and 94% of female students were proficient in isolation, an increase of 20% and 14% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in isolation between first grade male and female students was 8% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 2%. The females scored higher than the males.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in the fall, 63% of male and 71% female students were proficient in substitution. By spring, 86% of male and 90% of female students were proficient in substitution, an increase of 23% and 19% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in substitution between first grade male and female students was 8% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 4%. The females scored higher than the males.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in the fall, 62% of male and 72% female students were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 87% of male and 92% of female students were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 25% and 20% respectively.

Among second grade students, 75% of males and 82% of females were proficient in graphemes in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between males and female first grade students was 10% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 5%. The females still scored higher than the males. The

achievement gap between male and female second grade students was 7% (with females scoring higher than males) in graphemes.

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in the fall, 56% of male and 63% female students were proficient in decoding. By spring, 82% of male and 86% of female students were proficient in decoding, an increase of 26% and 23% respectively.

Among second grade students, 69% of males and 76% of females were proficient in decoding in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between males and female first grade students was 7% (with females scoring higher). Both male and female students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 4%. The females still scored higher than the males. The achievement gap between male and female second grade students was 7% (with females scoring higher than males) in decoding.

BRI Fluency. Among second grade students in the fall, 33% of male and 43% female students were proficient in fluency. By spring, 42% of male and 53% of female students were proficient in fluency, an increase of 9% and 10% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 37% of male and 42% female students were proficient in fluency. By spring, 36% of male and 42% of female students were proficient in fluency, a decrease of 1% and increase of 0% respectively.

Among first grade students, 41% of males and 53% of females were proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade male and female students was 10% (with female students scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 10 to 11% between fall and spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between the third grade male and female students was 5% (with female students scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 6% in the spring.

BRI Comprehension. Among second grade students in the fall, 20% of male and 26% female students were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 58% of male and 61% of female students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 38% and 35% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 52% of male and 49% female students were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 78% of male and 76% of female students were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 26% and 27% respectively.

Among first grade students, 53% of males and 59% of females were proficient in comprehension in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade male and female students was 6% (with female students scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in comprehension the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed from 6% to 3% between fall and spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between the third grade male and female students was 3% (with female students scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 2% in the spring.

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 61% of males and 64% of females were proficient. Among fourth graders, 66% of males, and 71% of females were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 40% of males and 43% of females were proficient in their comprehension skills. Among fourth graders, 47% of males and 48% of females were proficient in their comprehension skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade male students and female students was 3%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade male and female students was 5%. Female students scored higher than male students in both grades.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension IPR between third grade male students and female students was 3%, while the achievement gap between fourth grade males and females was only 1%. Female students scored higher than male students in both grades.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 63% of males and 64% of females were proficient. Among fourth graders, 62% of males, and 62% of females were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 44% of males and 44% of females were proficient in their vocabulary skills. Among fourth graders, 41% of males and 42% of females were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade male students and female students was 1% (with females scoring higher). At the fourth grade level, there was no achievement gap in vocabulary as both male and female students scored similarly.

At the third grade level, there was no achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary IPR as both male and female students scored similarly. The achievement gap between third grade male students and female students was only 1%, with female students scored higher than male students.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 63% of males and 64% of females were proficient. Among fourth graders, 66% of males, and 68% of females were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 42% of males and 46% of females were proficient in their reading skills. Among fourth graders, 45% of males and 46% of females were proficient in their reading skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade male students and female students was 1%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade male and female students was 2%. Female students scored higher than male students in both grades.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total IPR between third grade male students and female students was 4%, while the achievement gap between fourth grade males and females was only 1%. Female students scored higher than male students in both grades.

Students with an Economic Advantage/Disadvantage Scoring at Grade Level (see Table 9)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 55% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 71% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 87% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 91% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 32% and 20% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 76% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 88% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 85% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 91% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 9% and a decrease of 3% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between kindergarten students with and without an economic disadvantage was 16% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 4%, with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between first grade students with and without an economic disadvantage was 12% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed by half to 6%. Students without an economic disadvantage scored higher in the spring.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 42% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 56% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in deletion. By

spring, 77% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 83% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in deletion, an increase of 35% and 27% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 59% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 77% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in deletion. By spring, 82% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 91% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in deletion, an increase of 23% and 14% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between kindergarten students with and without an economic disadvantage was 14% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 6%, with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade students with and without an economic disadvantage was 18% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 9%. Students without an economic disadvantage scored higher in the spring.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 43% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 57% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in blending. By spring, 80% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 87% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in blending, an increase of 37% and 30% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 65% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 81% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in blending. By spring, 84% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 91% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in blending, an increase of 19% and 10% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between kindergarten students with and without an economic disadvantage was 14% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 7%, with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade students with and without an economic disadvantage was 16% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 7%. Students without an economic disadvantage scored higher in the spring.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in the fall, 79% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 90% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 95% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 96% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 16% and 6% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade students with and without an economic disadvantage was 11% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher).

Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 1%, with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in the fall, 68% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 85% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in isolation. By spring, 91% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 95% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in isolation, an increase of 23% and 10% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade students with and without an economic disadvantage was 17% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 4%, with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in the fall, 59% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 77% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in substitution. By spring, 84% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 92% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in substitution, an increase of 25% and 15% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in substitution between first grade students with and without an economic disadvantage was 18% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 8%, with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in the fall, 59% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 76% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 87% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 93% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 28% and 17% respectively.

Among second grade students, 73% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 85% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in graphemes in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between first grade students with and without an economic disadvantage was 17% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 6%. The students without an economic disadvantage scored higher than those with an economic disadvantage.

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in the fall, 50% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 71% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in decoding. By spring, 80% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 90% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in decoding, an increase of 30% and 19% respectively.

Among second grade students, 67% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 79% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in decoding in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between first grade students with and without an economic disadvantage was 21% (with those without an economic disadvantage scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 10%. The students without an economic disadvantage scored higher than those with an economic disadvantage.

BRI Fluency. . Among second grade students in the fall, 31% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 46% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in fluency. By spring, 39% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 57% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in fluency, an increase of 8% and 11% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 33% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 48% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in fluency. By spring, 32% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 49% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in fluency, a decrease of 1% and an increase 1% respectively.

Among first grade students, 38% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 60% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students with an economic advantage and those with an economic disadvantage was 15% (with students with an economic advantage scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 11% to 18% between fall and spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between third grade students with an economic advantage and those with an economic disadvantage was 15% (with students with an economic advantage scoring higher). By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 17%. (Only students with an economic advantage made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency in the spring).

BRI Comprehension. Among second grade students in the fall, 17% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 30% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 54% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 67% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 37% and 37% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 42% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 61% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 73% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 83% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 31% and 22% respectively.

Among first grade students, 49% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 66% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in comprehension in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade students with an economic advantage and those with an economic disadvantage was 13% (with students with an economic advantage scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups remained constant between fall and spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in BRI comprehension between third grade students with an economic advantage and those with an economic disadvantage was 19% (with students with an economic advantage scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 10% in the spring.

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 54% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 76% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient. Among fourth graders, 62% of students with an economic *disadvantage*, and 78% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 32% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 56% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in their comprehension skills. Among fourth graders, 38% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 60% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in their comprehension skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 22%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 16%. Students with no economic disadvantage scored higher than students with economic disadvantage in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension IPR between third grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 24%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 22%. Students with no economic disadvantage scored higher than students with economic disadvantage in both cases.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 54% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 77% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient. Among fourth graders, 53% of students with an economic *disadvantage*, and 73% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 34% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 59% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in their vocabulary skills. Among fourth graders, 32% of students

with an economic *disadvantage* and 55% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 23%. Similarly, the achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 20%. Students with no economic disadvantage scored higher than students with economic disadvantage in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary IPR between third grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 25%. Similarly, the achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 23%. Students with no economic disadvantage scored higher than students with economic disadvantage in both cases.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 54% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 76% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient. Among fourth graders, 58% of students with an economic *disadvantage*, and 78% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 33% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 60% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in their reading skills. Among fourth graders, 35% of students with an economic *disadvantage* and 59% of students with an economic *advantage* were proficient in their reading skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 22%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 20%. Students with no economic disadvantage scored higher than students with economic disadvantage in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total IPR between third grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was 27%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with economic disadvantage and those with no economic disadvantage was slightly smaller at 24%. Students with no economic disadvantage scored higher than students with economic disadvantage in both cases.

Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups, Fall, 2004-Spring, 2005 (see Tables 10a, 10b)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 70% of White students and 40% of Hispanic students, 58% of Black/African-American students, 55% of Asian students and 52% of Native Americans were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 92% of White students, 77% of Hispanic students, 89% of Black/African-American students, 91% of Asian students and 87% of

Native Americans were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 22%, 37%, 31%, 36%, and 35% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 86% of White students, 66% of Hispanic students, 81% of Black/African-American students, 84% of Asian students and 83% of Native Americans were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 90% of White students, 78% of Hispanic students, 85% of Black/African-American students, 89% of Asian students and 87% of Native Americans were proficient in deletion, an increase of 4%, 12%, 4%, 5%, and 4% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between the different kindergarten racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 30% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 12% gap between White and Black students, a 15% gap between White and Asian students, and an 18% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. At the same time, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 30% to 15%, for Black students from 12 to 3%, for Asian students from 15% to 1%, and for Native American students from 18% to 5% (White students continued to score higher).

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 20% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 5% gap between White and Black students, a 2% gap between White and Asian students, and a 3% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. While the achievement gap between White and Hispanic students narrowed from 20% to 12%, and between White and Asian students narrowed slightly from 2% to 1%, the achievement gap for Black and Native American students remained constant at 5% and 3%, respectively (White students continued to score higher).

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 56% of White students, 26% of Hispanic students, 44% of Black/African-American students, 28% of Asian students and 42% of Native Americans were proficient in deletion. By spring, 85% of White students and 66% of Hispanic, 69% of Black/African-American students, 79% of Asian students and 80% of Native Americans students were proficient in deletion, an increase of 29%, 40%, 25%, 51%, and 38% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 74% of White students, 51% of Hispanic students, 53% of Black/African-American students, 70% of Asian students and 47% of Native Americans were proficient in deletion. By spring, 91% of White students, 76% of Hispanic students, 74% of Black/African-American students, 82% of Asian students and 83% of Native Americans were proficient in deletion, an increase of 17%, 25%, 21%, 12%, and 36% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between the different kindergarten racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 30% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 12% gap between White and Black students, a 28% gap between White and Asian students, and a 14% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher

than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. Except for Black students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 30% to 19%, for Black students widened from 12% to 16%, for Asian students narrowed from 28% to 6%, and for Native American students narrowed from 14% to 5% (White students continued to score higher).

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 23% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 21% gap between White and Black students, a 4% gap between White and Asian students, and a 27% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. Except for Asian students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 23% to 15%, for Black students narrowed from 21% to 17%, for Asian students widened from 4% to 9%, and for Native American students narrowed from 27% to 8% (White students continued to score higher).

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 55% of White students, 37% of Hispanic students, 39% of Black/African-American students, 37% of Asian students and 52% of Native Americans were proficient in blending. By spring, 88% of White students, 76% of Hispanic students, 67% of Black/African-American students, 79% of Asian students and 77% of Native Americans were proficient in blending, an increase of 33%, 39%, 28%, 42%, and 25% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 78% of White students, 63% of Hispanic students, 54% of Black/African-American students, 64% of Asian students and 68% of Native Americans were proficient in blending. By spring, 90% of White students, 83% of Hispanic students, 74% of Black/African-American students, 85% of Asian students and 85% of Native Americans were proficient in blending, an increase of 12%, 20%, 20%, 21%, and 17% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between the different kindergarten racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 18% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 16% gap between White and Black students, a 18% gap between White and Asian students, and a 3% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. Except for Black and Native American students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. While the achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 18% to 12%, and for Asian students narrowed from 18% to 9%, the achievement gap for Black students widened from 16% to 21%, and for Native American students widened from 3% to 11% (White students continued to score higher).

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 15% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 24% gap between White and Black students, a 14% gap between White and Asian students, and a 10% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all

the other subgroups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in blending. The achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 15% to 7%, for Black students narrowed from 24% to 16%, for Asian students narrowed from 14% to 5%, and for Native American students narrowed from 10% to 5% (White students continued to score higher).

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in the fall, 88% of White students, 75% of Hispanic students, 79% of Black/African-American students, 91% of Asian students and 76% of Native Americans were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 96% of White students, 93% of Hispanic students, 92% of Black/African-American students, 98% of Asian students and 96% of Native Americans were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 8%, 18%, 13%, 7%, and 20% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 13% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 9% gap between White and Black students, a 3% gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 12% gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Asian students, White students scored higher than the other groups of students. By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. The achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 13% to 3%, for Black students narrowed from 9% to 4%, for Asian students narrowed from 3% to 2% (with Asian students scoring higher), and for Native American students narrowed from 12% to 0% (White students continued to score higher, with the exception of Asian students who scored higher than all the other subgroups).

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in the fall, 82% of White students, 65% of Hispanic students, 59% of Black/African-American students, 75% of Asian students and 63% of Native Americans were proficient in isolation. By spring, 95% of White students, 90% of Hispanic students, 87% of Black/African-American students, 95% of Asian students and 94% of Native Americans were proficient in isolation, an increase of 13%, 25%, 28%, 20%, and 31% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in isolation between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 17% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 23% gap between White and Black students, a 7% gap between White and Asian students, and a 19% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all other groups). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. The achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed substantially for all groups. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 17% to 5%, for Black students narrowed from 23% to 8%, for Asian students narrowed from 7% to 0%, and for Native American students narrowed from 19% to 1% (White students continued to score higher than the other subgroups, but they tied with Asian students, each having a 95% proficiency in isolation.).

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in the fall, 73% of White students, 57% of Hispanic students, 50% of Black/African-American students, 52% of Asian students and 64% of Native Americans were proficient in substitution. By spring, 91% of White students, 84% of Hispanic students, 75% of Black/African-American students, 85% of Asian students and 87% of Native Americans were proficient in substitution, an increase of 18%, 27%, 25%, 33%, and 23% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in substitution between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 16% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 23% gap between White and Black students, a 21% gap between White and Asian students, and a 9% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than Hispanic, Black, and Native American students, but lower than Asian students). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. At the same time, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 16% to 7%, for Black students narrowed from 23% to 16%, for Asian students narrowed from 21% to 6%, and for Native American students narrowed from 9% to 4% (White students continued to score higher than all the other subgroups).

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in the fall, 72% of White students, 58% of Hispanic students, 50% of Black/African-American students, 70% of Asian students and 58% of Native Americans were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 92% of White students, 87% of Hispanic students, 78% of Black/African-American students, 87% of Asian students and 87% of Native Americans were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 20%, 29%, 28%, 17%, and 29% respectively.

Among second grade students, 82% of White students, 72% of Hispanic students, 65% of Black/African-American students, 91% of Asian students and 86% of Native Americans were proficient in graphemes in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap in graphemes between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 14% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 22% gap between White and Black students, a 2% gap between White and Asian students, and a 14% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other students). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in rhyming. With the exception of Asian students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 14% to 5%, for Black students narrowed from 22% to 14%, and for Native American students narrowed from 14% to 5%. The achievement gap between White and Asian students widened from 2% to 5% (White students continued to score higher than all the other subgroups).

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in the fall, 64% of White students, 51% of Hispanic students, 42% of Black/African-American students, 54% of Asian students and 58% of Native Americans were proficient in decoding. By spring, 88% of White students, 80% of Hispanic students, 68% of Black/African-American students, 87% of Asian students and 80% of Native

Americans were proficient in decoding, an increase of 24%, 29%, 26%, 33%, and 22% respectively.

Among second grade students, 75% of White students, 68% of Hispanic students, 58% of Black/African-American students, 83% of Asian students and 78% of Native Americans were proficient in decoding in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap in decoding between the different first grade racial groups varied between the subgroups. There was a 13% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 22% gap between White and Black students, a 10% gap between White and Asian students, and a 6% gap between White and Native American students (with White students scoring higher than all the other students). By spring, all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in decoding. With the exception of Native American students, the achievement gap between White and all other subgroups narrowed. The achievement gap for Hispanic students narrowed from 13% to 8%, for Black students narrowed slightly from 22% to 20%, and for Asian students narrowed from 10% to 1%. The achievement gap between White and Native American students widened slightly from 6% to 8% (White students continued to score higher than all the other subgroups).

BRI Fluency. Among second grade students in the fall, 41% of White students, 28% of Hispanic students, 29% of Black/African-American students, 47% of Asian students and 41% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency. By spring, 52% of White students, 40% of Hispanic students, 28% of Black/African-American students, 48% of Asian students and 45% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency, an increase of 11%, 12%, a decrease of 1%, an increase of 1%, and 4% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 42% of White students, 31% of Hispanic students, 30% of Black/African-American students, 50% of Asian students and 45% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency. By spring, 42% of White students, 33% of Hispanic students, 28% of Black/African-American students, 45% of Asian students and 37% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency, an increase of 0%, 2%, a decrease of 2%, 5%, and 8% respectively.

Among first grade students, 52% of White students, 37% of Hispanic students, 32% of Black/African-American students, 56% of Asian students and 33% of Native Americans were proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students varied by racial group. There was a 13% gap between White and Hispanic students, 12% gap between White and Black students, 6 percent gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and no gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Black students, all groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency. By spring, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 13% to 12%, it also narrowed between White and Asian students from 6% to 4% due to White students scoring higher. However, the achievement gap between White and Black students widened from 12% to 24%, and between White and Native American students from 0% to 7%. White students scored higher than all the other groups in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between third grade students varied by racial group. There was a 11% gap between White and Hispanic students, 12% gap between White and Black students, 8 percent gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 3% gap between White and Native American students (with Native American students scoring higher). Hispanic students were the only group which made progress in the spring, while White students' progress remained constant. All the other groups, Black, Asian and Native Americans did not make progress in fluency in the spring. By spring, the achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students narrowed from 11% to 9%, it also narrowed between White and Asian students from 8% to 3% (due to Asian students decreasing the percentage of students proficient fluency in the spring). However, the achievement gap between White and Black students widened from 12% to 14%, and between White and Native American students from 3% to 5% (due to Native American students decreasing the percentage of students proficient in fluency in the spring). With the exception of Asian students, White students scored higher than all the other groups in the spring.

BRI Comprehension. Among second grade students in the fall, 27% of White students, 12% of Hispanic students, 15% of Black/African-American students, 19% of Asian students and 14% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 66% of White students, 41% of Hispanic students, 51% of Black/African-American students, 64% of Asian students and 57% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 39%, 29%, 36%, 45%, and 43% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 56% of White students, 32% of Hispanic students, 44% of Black/African-American students, 33% of Asian students and 41% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 82% of White students, 64% of Hispanic students, 67% of Black/African-American students, 75% of Asian students and 67% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 26%, 32%, 23%, 42%, and 26% respectively.

Among first grade students, 62% of White students, 42% of Hispanic students, 42% of Black/African-American students, 49% of Asian students and 47% of Native Americans were proficient in comprehension in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in BRI comprehension between second grade students varied by racial group. There was a 15% gap between White and Hispanic students, 12% gap between White and Black students, 8% percent gap between White and Asian students (with Asian students scoring higher), and a 13% gap between White and Native American students. While all the groups made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in comprehension in the spring, the achievement gap widened for some groups. The achievement gap between White students and Hispanic students widened from 15% to 25%, and between White and Black students widened from 12% to 15%. For the other two groups, the achievement gap narrowed between White and Asian students from 8% to 2%, and between White and Native American students from 13% to 9%. White students scored higher than all the other groups in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in BRI comprehension between third grade students varied by racial group. There was a 24% gap between White and Hispanic students, 12% gap between

White and Black students, 23% gap between White and Asian students, and a 15% gap between White and Native American students. All groups made substantial progress in the spring. By spring, the achievement gap between White and Hispanic students narrowed from 24% to 18%, between White and Asian students it narrowed substantially from 23% to 7% (with Asian students scoring higher), between White and Black students, the gap widened slightly from 12% to 15%, and between White and Native American students the remained constant.

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 68% of White students, 49% of Hispanic students, 45% of Black/African-American students, 65% of Asian students and 72% of Native Americans were proficient. Among fourth graders, 74% of White students, 56% of Hispanic students, 54% of Black/African-American students, 62% of Asian students and 58% of Native Americans were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 48% of White students, 29% of Hispanic students, 22% of Black/African-American students, 37% of Asian students and 40% of Native Americans were proficient in their comprehension skills. Among fourth graders, 55% of White students, 27% of Hispanic students, 29% of Black/African-American students, 38% of Asian students and 21% of Native Americans were proficient in their comprehension skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 19% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 23% gap between White and Black students, a 3% gap between White and Asian students, and a 4% gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Native American students who scored higher than White students, White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was an 18% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 20% gap between White and Black students, a 12% gap between White and Asian students, and a 16% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension IPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 19% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 26% gap between White and Black students, 11% gap between White and Asian students, and 8% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 28% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 26% gap between White and Black students, a 17% gap between White and Asian students, and a 34% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 69% of White students, 50% of Hispanic students, 45% of Black/African-American students, 52% of Asian students and 77% of Native Americans were proficient. Among fourth graders, 71% of White students, 41% of Hispanic students, 43% of Black/African-American students, 38% of Asian students and 44% of Native Americans were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 50% of White students, 27% of Hispanic students, 26% of Black/African-American students, 33% of Asian students and 64% of Native Americans were proficient in their vocabulary skills. Among fourth graders, 50% of White students, 20% of Hispanic students, 24% of Black/African-American students, 24% of Asian students and 23% of Native Americans were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 19% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 24% gap between White and Black students, a 17% gap between White and Asian students, and 8 % gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Native American students who scored higher than White students, White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 30% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 28% gap between White and Black students, a 33% gap between White and Asian students, and a 27% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary IPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 23% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 24% gap between White and Black students, 17% gap between White and Asian students, and a 14% gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Native American students who scored higher than White students, White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 30% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 26% gap between White and Black students, a 26% gap between White and Asian students, and a 27% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 69% of White students, 49% of Hispanic, 46% of Black/African-American students, 62% of Asian students and 77% of Native Americans were proficient. Among fourth graders, 74% of White students, 52% of Hispanic students, 47% of Black/African-American students, 52% of Asian students and 54% of Native Americans were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 50% of White students, 28% of Hispanic students, 23% of Black/African-American students, 38% of Asian students and 57% of Native Americans were proficient in their reading skills. Among fourth graders, 54% of White students, 23% of Hispanic students, 26% of Black/African-American students, 29% of Asian students and 28% of Native Americans were proficient in their reading skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 20% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 23% gap between White and Black students, a 7% gap between White and Asian students, and 8% gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Native American students

who scored higher than White students, White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 22% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 27% gap between White and Black students, a 22% gap between White and Asian students, and a 20% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total IPR between the different racial groups varied. Among third graders, there was a 22% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 27% gap between White and Black students, 12% gap between White and Asian students, and a 7% gap between White and Native American students. With the exception of Native American students who scored higher than White students, White students scored higher than all the other groups. Among fourth graders, there was a 31% gap between White and Hispanic students, a 28% gap between White and Black students, a 25% gap between White and Asian students, and a 26% gap between White and Native American students. White students scored higher than all the other racial groups.

Students *With and Without* Disabilities Scoring at Grade Level (see Table 11)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 43% of students *with* disabilities and 64% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 74% of students *with* disabilities and 90% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 31% and 26% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 58% of students *with* disabilities and 84% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 69% of students *with* disabilities and 90% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 11% and 6% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between kindergarten students with and without disabilities was 21% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). Both students with and without disabilities made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 16%. The students without disabilities still scored higher than the students with disabilities.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between first grade students with and without disabilities was 26% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). Both students with and without disabilities made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 21%. The students without disabilities scored higher than the students with disabilities.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 29% of students *with* disabilities and 50% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion. By spring, 61% of students *with* disabilities and 82% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion, an increase of 32% and 32% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 38% of students *with* disabilities and 71% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion. By spring, 64% of students *with* disabilities and

89% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in deletion, an increase of 26% and 18% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between kindergarten students with and without disabilities was 21% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). While both students with and without disabilities made progress in the spring, the 21% gap between the percentage of students with and without disabilities proficient in deletion remained constant.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between first grade students with and without disabilities was 33% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 25%.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 29% of students *with* disabilities and 51% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending. By spring, 64% of students *with* disabilities and 85% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending, an increase of 35% and 34% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 46% of students *with* disabilities and 76% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending. By spring, 65% of students *with* disabilities and 90% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in blending, an increase of 19% and 14% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between kindergarten students with and without disabilities was 22% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). While both students with and without disabilities made progress in the spring, the achievement gap between the two groups narrowed slightly to 21%.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between first grade students with and without disabilities was 30% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 25%. Students with no disabilities scored higher than students without disabilities.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in the fall, 62% of students *with* disabilities and 87% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 80% of students *with* disabilities and 97% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 18% and 10% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between first grade students with and without disabilities was 25% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 17%. Students with no disabilities scored higher than students without disabilities.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in the fall, 43% of students *with* disabilities and 80% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in isolation. By spring, 69% of students *with* disabilities and 96% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in isolation, an increase of 26% and 16% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between first grade students with and without disabilities was 37% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 27%. Students with no disabilities scored higher than students without disabilities.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in the fall, 39% of students *with* disabilities and 70% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in substitution. By spring, 64% of students *with* disabilities and 91% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in substitution, an increase of 25% and 21% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in substitution between first grade students with and without disabilities was 31% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed to 27%. Students with no disabilities scored higher than students without disabilities.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in the fall, 37% of students *with* disabilities and 70% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 62% of students *with* disabilities and 93% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 25% and 23% respectively.

Among second grade students, 45% of students *with* disabilities and 83% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in graphemes in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between first grade students with and without disabilities was 33% (with students without disabilities scoring higher). Both groups of students made progress in the spring, and the achievement gap narrowed slightly to 31%. The students without disabilities scored higher than those with an economic disadvantage.

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in the fall, 30% of students *with* disabilities and 63% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in decoding. By spring, 53% of students *with* disabilities and 88% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in decoding, an increase of 23% and 25% respectively.

Among second grade students, 38% of students *with* disabilities and 77% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in decoding in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap between first grade students with and without disabilities was 33% (with students without disabilities scoring higher). While both groups of students made progress in increasing the percentage of students proficient in decoding in the spring, the achievement gap widened slightly to 35%. The students without disabilities scored higher than those with disabilities.

BRI Fluency. Among second grade students in the fall, 13% of students *with* disabilities and 41% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency. By spring, 16% of students *with*

disabilities and 52% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency, an increase of 3% and 11% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 13% of students *with* disabilities and 44% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency. By spring, 12% of students *with* disabilities and 45% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency, a decrease of 1% and an increase 1% respectively.

Among first grade students, 20% of students *with* disabilities and 51% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students with and without disabilities was 28% (without disabilities scoring higher). While both students with and without disabilities made progress in the spring, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 28% to 36% between fall and spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between third grade students with and without disabilities was 31% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). While both students with and without disabilities made progress in the spring, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 31% to 33% between fall and spring.

BRI Comprehension. Among second grade students in the fall, 7% of students *with* disabilities and 25% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 29% of students *with* disabilities and 64% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 22% and 39% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 18% of students *with* disabilities and 56% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 46% of students *with* disabilities and 83% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 28% and 27% respectively.

Among first grade students, 29% of students *with* disabilities and 60% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in comprehension in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade students with and without disabilities was 18% (without disabilities scoring higher). While both students with and without disabilities made progress in the spring, the achievement gap between these two groups widened from 18% to 35% between fall and spring. This was due to students without disabilities scoring much higher than they did in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between third grade students with and without disabilities was 38% (with students with no disabilities scoring higher). While both students with and without disabilities made progress in the spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed slightly from 38% to 37% between fall and spring.

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 28% of students *with* disabilities and 70% of students *without* disabilities were proficient. Among fourth graders, 28% of students *with* disabilities, and 77% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 13% of students *with* disabilities and 48% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their comprehension skills. Among fourth graders, 16% of students *with* disabilities and 54% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their comprehension skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 42%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 49%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension IPR between third grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 35%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 38%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 34% of students *with* disabilities and 69% of students *without* disabilities were proficient. Among fourth graders, 30% of students *with* disabilities, and 69% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 19% of students *with* disabilities and 49% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their vocabulary skills. Among fourth graders, 14% of students *with* disabilities and 48% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 35%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 39%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary IPR between third grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 30%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 34%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 28% of students *with* disabilities and 70% of students *without* disabilities were proficient. Among fourth graders, 27% of students *with* disabilities, and 75% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 15% of students *with* disabilities and 50% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their reading skills. Among fourth graders, 14% of students *with* disabilities and 52% of students *without* disabilities were proficient in their reading skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 42%. The achievement gap in reading total between fourth grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 48%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total IPR between third grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 35%. The achievement gap in reading total between fourth grade students with disabilities and those without disabilities was 38%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

Students *With and Without* Limited English Proficiency Scoring at Grade Level (see Table12)

PAT Rhyming. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 40% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 65% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 75% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 91% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 35% and 26% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 61% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 85% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming. By spring, 74% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 90% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in rhyming, an increase of 13% and 5% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between the kindergarten students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 25%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 16%. In both fall and spring the students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in rhyming between the first grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 24%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 16%. In both fall and spring students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

PAT Deletion. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 20% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 52% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion. By spring, 65% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 82% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion, an increase of 45% and 30% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 48% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 70% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion. By spring, 74% of

students *with* limited English proficiency and 88% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in deletion, an increase of 26% and 18% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between the kindergarten students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 32%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 17%. In both fall and spring the students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in deletion between the first grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 22%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 14%. In both fall and spring students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

PAT Blending. Among kindergarten students in the fall, 32% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 52% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending. By spring, 74% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 84% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending, an increase of 42% and 32% respectively.

Among first grade students in the fall, 61% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 74% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending. By spring, 83% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 88% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in blending, an increase of 22% and 14% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between the kindergarten students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 20%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups had narrowed by half to 10%. In both fall and spring the students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in blending between the first grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 13%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 5%. In both fall and spring students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

PAT Segmentation. Among first grade students in the fall, 75% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 86% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in segmentation. By spring, 92% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 96% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in segmentation, an increase of 17% and 10% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in segmentation between the first grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 11%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 4%. Students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency in both fall and spring.

PAT Isolation. Among first grade students in the fall, 66% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 77% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in isolation.

By spring, 90% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 93% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in isolation, an increase of 24% and 16% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in isolation between the first grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 11%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 3%. Students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency in both fall and spring.

PAT Substitution. Among first grade students in the fall, 55% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 69% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in substitution. By spring, 83% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 88% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in substitution, an increase of 28% and 19% respectively.

In the fall, the achievement gap in substitution between the first grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 14%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 5%. Students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency in both fall and spring.

PAT Graphemes. Among first grade students in the fall, 56% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 68% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in graphemes. By spring, 86% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 90% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in graphemes, an increase of 30% and 22% respectively.

Among second grade students, 73% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 79% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in graphemes in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap in graphemes between first grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 12%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups had narrowed to 4%. In both fall and spring the students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in graphemes between second grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 6% (with students with English proficiency scoring higher than students without English proficiency).

PAT Decoding. Among first grade students in the fall, 48% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 61% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in decoding. By spring, 81% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 84% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in decoding, an increase of 33% and 23% respectively.

Among second grade students, 70% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 73% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in decoding in the fall.

In the fall, the achievement gap in decoding between first students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 13%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups had narrowed to 3%. In both fall and spring the students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in decoding between second grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 3% (with students with English proficiency scoring higher than students without English proficiency).

BRI Fluency. Among second grade students in the fall, 28% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 39% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency. By spring, 38% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 48% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency, an increase of 10% and 9% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 30% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 41% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency. By spring, 31% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 41% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency, an increase of 1% among students *with* limited English proficiency and no change for student *without* limited English proficiency.

Among first grade students, 40% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 48% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in fluency in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between second grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 11%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 10%. In both fall and spring the students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between the third grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 11%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 10%. In both fall and spring students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

BRI Comprehension. Among second grade students in the fall, 10% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 25% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 46% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 62% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 36% and 37% respectively.

Among third grade students in the fall, 25% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 54% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension. By spring, 62% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 79% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension, an increase of 37% and 25% respectively.

Among first grade students, 38% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 59% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in comprehension in the spring.

In the fall, the achievement gap in comprehension between second grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 15%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups widened to 16%. In both fall and spring the students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

In the fall, the achievement gap in fluency between the third grade students with English proficiency and those without English proficiency was 29%. By spring, the achievement gap between these two groups narrowed to 17%. In both fall and spring students with English proficiency scored higher than students without English proficiency.

ITBS Reading Comprehension. ITBS Comprehension scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 47% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 65% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient. Among fourth graders, 50% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 71% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their comprehension skills.

ITBS Comprehension scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 24% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 45% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their comprehension skills. Among fourth graders, 24% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 51% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their comprehension skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension NPR between third grade students with and without English proficiency was 18%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with and without English proficiency was 21%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Comprehension IPR between third grade students with and without English proficiency was 21%. The achievement gap in reading comprehension between fourth grade students with and without English proficiency was 27%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

ITBS Vocabulary. ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 43% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 66% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient. Among fourth graders, 32% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 66% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

ITBS Vocabulary scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 22% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 47% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their vocabulary skills. Among fourth graders, 15% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 46% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their vocabulary skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary NPR between third grade students with and without English proficiency was 23%. The achievement gap in vocabulary between fourth grade students with and without English proficiency was 34%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Vocabulary IPR between third grade students with and without English proficiency was 25%. The achievement gap in vocabulary between fourth grade students with and without English proficiency was 31%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

ITBS Reading Total. ITBS Reading Total scores based upon national percentile ranks (NPR) indicate that among third graders, 46% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 66% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient. Among fourth graders, 45% of students *with* limited English proficiency, and 70% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their reading skills.

ITBS Reading Total scores based upon Iowa percentile ranks (IPR) indicated that among third graders, 24% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 47% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their reading skills. Among fourth graders, 17% of students *with* limited English proficiency and 49% of students *without* limited English proficiency were proficient in their reading skills.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total NPR between third grade students with and without English proficiency was 20%. The achievement gap in reading total between fourth grade students with and without English proficiency was 25%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

The achievement gap in ITBS Reading Total IPR between third grade students with and without English proficiency was 23%. The achievement gap in reading total between fourth grade students with and without English proficiency was 32%. Students without disabilities scored higher than students with disabilities in both cases.

Special Education Data by Grade (see Table 13)

Data was collected to assess the number of students receiving Special Education services, the number of students referred to pre-referral services and the number of pre-referrals that resulted in an IEP for students.

Students currently receiving special education services. In 2003-2004, 10% of kindergarten students were identified as receiving special education services. In 2004-2005 the percentage of kindergarten students receiving special education services increased by 1% (11% total).

The percentage of students receiving special education services also increased for 1st graders (10% in 2003-2004; 12% in 2004-2005; an increase of 2%), 2nd graders 13% in 2003-2004; 14% in 2004-2005; an increase of 1%), 3rd graders (14% in 2003-2004; 17% in 2004-2005; an increase of 3%), and 4th graders (16% in 2003-2004; 17% in 2004-2005; an increase of 1%)

Percentage of students referred for pre-referral services. In 2003-2004, 4% of kindergarten students were referred for pre-referral services. In 2004-2005 the 4% of kindergarten students referred for pre-referral services.

The percentage of students referred for pre-referral services also increased for 1st graders (5% in 2003-2004; 6% in 2004-2005; an increase of 1%), 2nd graders (5% in 2003-2004; 8% in 2004-2005; an increase of 3%), 3rd graders (4% in 2003-2004; 7% in 2004-2005; an increase of 3%), and 4th graders (3% in 2003-2004; 5% in 2004-2005; an increase of 2%).

Percentage of students placed in special education services. In 2003-2004, 2% of kindergarten students had an IEP initiated and place in special education services. In 2004-2005 the percentage of kindergarten students that had an IEP initiated decreased by 1% (1% total).

The percentage of students that had an IEP initiated and place in special education services also increased for 1st graders (2% in 2003-2004; 3% in 2004-2005; an increase of 1%), 2nd graders (2% in 2003-2004; 3% in 2004-2005; an increase of 1%), 3rd graders (1% in 2003-2004; 3% in 2004-2005; an increase of 2%), and 4th graders (0% in 2003-2004; 2% in 2004-2005; an increase of 2%).

Table 5. Number and Percentage of Performance Benchmarks Met

Test	Performance Benchmark Met 2004-2005, Year 2							
	Grade							
	K		1		2		3	
PAT Rhyming	52	100.00%	52	100.00%				
PAT Deletion	50	96.15%	52	100.00%				
PAT Blending	51	98.08%	50	96.15%				
PAT Segmentation			52	100.00%				
PAT Isolation			52	100.00%				
PAT Substitution			52	100.00%				
PAT Graphemes			52	100.00%				
PAT Decoding			52	100.00%				
BRI Fluency					17	32.69%	9	17.31%
BRI Comprehension					42	80.77%	47	90.38%

Test	Performance Benchmark Met 2003-2004 (Year1) to 2004-2005 (Year2)			
	Grade			
	Grade 1 (Y1) to Grade 1 (Y2)		Grade 2 (Y1) to Grade 2 (Y2)	
PAT Graphemes			44	84.62%
PAT Decoding			31	59.62%
BRI Fluency	17	32.69%		
BRI Comprehension	26	50.00%		

Test	ITBS Performance Benchmark Met 2003-2004 (Year1) to 2004-2005 (Year2) Comparison					
	Grade					
	Grade 3 (Y1) to Grade 3 (Y2)		Grade 4 (Y1) to Grade 4 (Y2)		Grade 3 (Y1) to Grade 4 (Y2)	
ITBS Comprehension NPR	23	44.23%	29	55.77%	36	69.23%
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	28	53.85%	26	50.00%	27	51.92%
ITBS Reading Total NPR	24	46.15%	29	55.77%	33	63.46%

Note: Number in cell reflects the number of schools meeting the Performance Benchmark.
 Percentage reflects the percentage of schools meeting the Performance Benchmark.

Table 6. Number of Greatest Gains Achieved by School

SCHOOL	ITBS Grade 3 Subtotal	ITBS Grade 4 Subtotal	ITBS Grade 3-4 Subtotal	ITBS GRAND TOTAL
Clearfield Elementary	3		3	6
Wall Lake View Auburn Elementary	3		3	6
Ottumwa - Wilson Elementary		3	2	5
Albert City Truesdale Elementary		1	3	4
Davenport - Buchanan Elementary	1	2	1	4
Des Moines - Wallace Elementary		2	2	4
Storm Lake - South Elementary	1	2	1	4
Charter Oak-Ute Elementary	2		1	3
Council Bluffs - Pusey Elementary	1	1	1	3
Des Moines - Moulton Elementary		2	1	3
Sentral Elementary		3		3
Council Bluffs - Longfellow Elementary	2			2
Davenport - Fillmore Elementary	1		1	2
Des Moines - Edmunds Academy of Fine Arts		2		2
Garnavillo Elementary School		2		2
New Market Elementary	1		1	2
Ottumwa - James Elementary	1		1	2
Sioux City - Hunt Elementary		2		2
South Tama - Primary/Intermediate**	2			2
Storm Lake - East/North Elementary**			2	2
Alden Elementary		1		1
Chariton - Columbus/Van Allen Elementary**	1			1
Columbus - Roundy Elementary		1		1
Council Bluffs - Carter Lake Elementary	1			1
Russell - Elementary	1			1
South Page Elementary			1	1
Storm Lake - West Elementary	1			1

**Two elementary schools combined

***Only schools with a score of 1 or more Greatest Gains met are included in table.

Table 7. Number of Students Proficient

The tables below indicate the number of students scoring at or above proficiency in the Fall, 2004 and the Spring, 2005 in participating Iowa Reading First schools. The “N” is number of students who were proficient in each skill and “Total” reflects the total number of students tested.

School Year:	2004-2005									
Semester:	Fall									
Grouped By:	All Students									
Created On:	2005-10-12									
	All Students									
	Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
Assessment	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
PAT Rhyming	1454	2347	1825	2240						
PAT Deletion	1129	2347	1504	2240						
PAT Blending	1159	2347	1622	2240						
PAT Segmentation			1886	2240						
PAT Isolation			1696	2240						
PAT Substitution			1500	2240						
PAT Graphemes			1494	2240	1739	2216				
PAT Decoding			1327	2240	1600	2216				
BRI Fluency					841	2223	829	2104		
BRI Comprehension					504	2223	1059	2104		
ITBS Comprehension NPR										
ITBS Vocabulary NPR										
ITBS Reading Total NPR										
ITBS Comprehension IPR										
ITBS Vocabulary IPR										
ITBS Reading Total IPR										

School Year:	2004-2005									
Semester:	Spring									
Grouped By:	All Students									
Created On:	2005-10-12									
	All Students									
	Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
Assessment	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
PAT Rhyming	2035	2294	1925	2199						
PAT Deletion	1824	2294	1887	2197						
PAT Blending	1896	2292	1913	2199						
PAT Segmentation			2095	2199						
PAT Isolation			2045	2199						
PAT Substitution			1927	2199						
PAT Graphemes			1966	2197						
PAT Decoding			1846	2197						
BRI Fluency			1029	2188	1018	2176	829	2112		
BRI Comprehension			1224	2188	1294	2176	1627	2112		
ITBS Comprehension NPR							1314	2103	1423	2074
ITBS Vocabulary NPR							1328	2102	1285	2074
ITBS Reading Total NPR							1328	2103	1388	2074
ITBS Comprehension IPR							879	2103	981	2074
ITBS Vocabulary IPR							923	2103	869	2074
ITBS Reading Total IPR							924	2103	937	2074

Disaggregation Of Students By Demographics

The following tables indicate the number of students scoring at or above proficiency for disaggregated by the five demographic categories (gender, students with economic advantage/disadvantage, major racial/ethnic groups, students with/without disabilities, and students with/without limited English Proficiency). Data is presented for Fall, 2004 and Spring, 2005. The “N” is number of students who were proficient in each skill and “Total” reflects the total number of students tested.

Table 8. Results for Students by Gender

Fall, 2004	Male Students										Female Students									
	Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
Assessment	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
PAT Rhyming	737	1239	889	1125							717	1108	936	1115						
PAT Deletion	575	1239	747	1125							554	1108	757	1115						
PAT Blending	572	1239	773	1125							587	1108	849	1115						
PAT Segmentation			921	1125									965	1115						
PAT Isolation			808	1125									888	1115						
PAT Substitution			711	1125									789	1115						
PAT Graphemes			695	1125	883	1172							799	1115	856	1044				
PAT Decoding			626	1125	804	1172							701	1115	796	1044				
BRI Fluency					390	1174	404	1086							451	1049	425	1018		
BRI Comprehension					231	1174	563	1086							273	1049	496	1018		
ITBS Comprehension NPR																				
ITBS Vocabulary NPR																				
ITBS Reading Total NPR																				
ITBS Comprehension IPR																				
ITBS Vocabulary IPR																				
ITBS Reading Total IPR																				

Spring, 2005	Male Students										Female Students									
	Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
Assessment	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
PAT Rhyming	1053	1201	949	1105							982	1093	976	1094						
PAT Deletion	925	1201	941	1105							899	1093	946	1092						
PAT Blending	961	1201	941	1105							935	1091	972	1094						
PAT Segmentation			1042	1105									1053	1094						
PAT Isolation			1012	1105									1033	1094						
PAT Substitution			946	1105									981	1094						
PAT Graphemes			960	1103									1006	1094						
PAT Decoding			900	1103									946	1094						
BRI Fluency			452	1098	478	1150	391	1079					577	1090	540	1026	438	1033		
BRI Comprehension			584	1098	666	1150	838	1079					640	1090	628	1026	789	1033		
ITBS Comprehension NPR							655	1070	706	1062							659	1033	717	1012
ITBS Vocabulary NPR							669	1069	656	1062							659	1033	629	1012
ITBS Reading Total NPR							670	1070	701	1062							658	1033	687	1012
ITBS Comprehension IPR							431	1070	494	1062							448	1033	487	1012
ITBS Vocabulary IPR							471	1070	440	1062							452	1033	429	1012
ITBS Reading Total IPR							452	1070	475	1062							472	1033	462	1012

Table 9. Results for Students With and Without Economic Disadvantage

Assessment	Economically Advantaged Students										Economically Disadvantaged Students									
	Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
Fall, 2004																				
PAT Rhyming	737	1033	884	1005							717	1314	941	1235						
PAT Deletion	577	1033	772	1005							552	1314	732	1235						
PAT Blending	590	1033	817	1005							569	1314	805	1235						
PAT Segmentation			906	1005									980	1235						
PAT Isolation			851	1005									845	1235						
PAT Substitution			771	1005									729	1235						
PAT Graphemes			765	1004	853	1009							729	1236	886	1207				
PAT Decoding			709	1004	795	1009							618	1236	805	1207				
BRI Fluency					463	1012	447	934							378	1211	382	1170		
BRI Comprehension					300	1012	570	934							204	1211	489	1170		
ITBS Comprehension NPR																				
ITBS Vocabulary NPR																				
ITBS Reading Total NPR																				
ITBS Comprehension IPR																				
ITBS Vocabulary IPR																				
ITBS Reading Total IPR																				

Assessment	Economically Advantaged Students										Economically Disadvantaged Students									
	Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
Spring, 2005																				
PAT Rhyming	819	900	827	905							1216	1394	1098	1294						
PAT Deletion	751	900	827	905							1073	1394	1060	1292						
PAT Blending	778	899	827	905							1118	1393	1086	1294						
PAT Segmentation			869	905									1226	1294						
PAT Isolation			861	905									1184	1294						
PAT Substitution			837	905									1090	1294						
PAT Graphemes			844	903									1122	1294						
PAT Decoding			816	903									1030	1294						
BRI Fluency			541	896	525	915	419	849					488	1292	493	1261	410	1263		
BRI Comprehension			587	896	614	915	706	849					637	1292	680	1261	921	1263		
ITBS Comprehension NPR							635	837	694	890							679	1266	729	1184
ITBS Vocabulary NPR							641	837	654	890							687	1265	631	1184
ITBS Reading Total NPR							640	837	696	890							688	1266	692	1184
ITBS Comprehension IPR							472	837	531	890							407	1266	450	1184
ITBS Vocabulary IPR							493	837	491	890							430	1266	378	1184
ITBS Reading Total IPR							501	837	523	890							423	1266	414	1184

Table 10a. Results for Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups (Fall, 2004)

Number of Students From Major Race/Ethnicity Groups (Fall, 2004)											
		White		American Indian or Alaskan Native		Asian		Black or African American		Hispanic or Latino	
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
PAT Rhyming	K	1069	1538	33	64	39	71	148	256	165	416
PAT Rhyming	1	1285	1499	49	59	47	56	182	226	262	400
PAT Deletion	K	858	1538	27	64	20	71	113	256	110	416
PAT Deletion	1	1116	1499	28	59	39	56	119	226	202	400
PAT Blending	K	847	1538	33	64	26	71	100	256	153	416
PAT Blending	1	1172	1499	40	59	36	56	122	226	252	400
PAT Segmentation	1	1314	1499	45	59	51	56	178	226	298	400
PAT Isolation	1	1223	1499	37	59	42	56	134	226	260	400
PAT Substitution	1	1090	1499	38	59	29	56	114	226	229	400
PAT Graphemes	1	1076	1499	34	59	39	56	112	225	233	401
PAT Graphemes	2	1193	1463	42	49	71	78	159	245	274	381
PAT Decoding	1	965	1499	34	59	30	56	94	225	204	401
PAT Decoding	2	1097	1463	38	49	65	78	141	245	259	381
BRI Fluency	2	603	1468	20	49	37	78	72	246	107	380
BRI Fluency	3	613	1459	23	51	27	54	57	192	108	347
BRI Comprehension	2	399	1468	7	49	15	78	36	246	45	380
BRI Comprehension	3	824	1459	21	51	18	54	84	192	111	347
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3										
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4										
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3										
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4										
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3										
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4										
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3										
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4										
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3										
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4										
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3										
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4										

Table 10b. Results for Students from Major Racial/Ethnic Groups (Spring, 2005)

Number of Students From Major Race/Ethnicity Groups (Spring, 2005)											
		White		American Indian or Alaskan Native		Asian		Black or African American		Hispanic or Latino	
Assessment	Grade	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
PAT Rhyming	K	1377	1499	53	61	64	70	225	254	316	410
PAT Rhyming	1	1336	1478	47	54	49	55	197	233	296	379
PAT Deletion	K	1274	1499	49	61	55	70	174	254	272	410
PAT Deletion	1	1338	1478	45	54	45	55	172	233	287	377
PAT Blending	K	1313	1498	47	61	55	70	170	254	311	409
PAT Blending	1	1331	1478	46	54	47	55	173	233	316	379
PAT Segmentation	1	1423	1478	52	54	54	55	215	233	351	379
PAT Isolation	1	1399	1478	51	54	52	55	202	233	341	379
PAT Substitution	1	1341	1478	47	54	47	55	175	233	317	379
PAT Graphemes	1	1362	1478	47	54	48	55	182	232	327	378
PAT Decoding	1	1295	1478	43	54	48	55	157	232	303	378
BRI Fluency	1	766	1475	18	55	31	55	73	226	141	377
BRI Fluency	2	744	1435	20	44	35	73	66	239	153	385
BRI Fluency	3	614	1458	19	51	24	53	55	200	117	350
BRI Comprehension	1	919	1475	26	55	27	55	95	226	157	377
BRI Comprehension	2	943	1435	25	44	47	73	121	239	158	385
BRI Comprehension	3	1195	1458	34	51	40	53	134	200	224	350
ITBS Comprehension NPR	3	987	1461	34	47	34	52	88	195	171	348
ITBS Comprehension NPR	4	1075	1456	33	57	39	63	96	178	180	320
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	3	1004	1461	36	47	27	52	87	195	174	347
ITBS Vocabulary NPR	4	1027	1456	25	57	24	63	77	178	132	320
ITBS Reading Total NPR	3	1001	1461	36	47	32	52	89	195	170	348
ITBS Reading Total NPR	4	1074	1456	31	57	33	63	83	178	167	320
ITBS Comprehension IPR	3	699	1461	19	47	19	52	42	195	100	348
ITBS Comprehension IPR	4	807	1456	12	57	24	63	51	178	87	320
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	3	730	1461	30	47	17	52	51	195	95	348
ITBS Vocabulary IPR	4	734	1456	13	57	15	63	42	178	65	320
ITBS Reading Total IPR	3	733	1461	27	47	20	52	45	195	99	348
ITBS Reading Total IPR	4	782	1456	16	57	18	63	46	178	75	320

Table 11. Results for Students With and Without Disabilities

Fall, 2004	Students without Disabilities										Students with Disabilities									
	Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
PAT Rhyming	1369	2148	1681	1993							85	199	144	247						
PAT Deletion	1072	2148	1409	1993							57	199	95	247						
PAT Blending	1102	2148	1509	1993							57	199	113	247						
PAT Segmentation			1734	1993									152	247						
PAT Isolation			1591	1993									105	247						
PAT Substitution			1403	1993									97	247						
PAT Graphemes			1403	1993	1622	1954							91	247	117	262				
PAT Decoding			1252	1993	1500	1954							75	247	100	262				
BRI Fluency					806	1961	786	1772							35	262	43	332		
BRI Comprehension					486	1961	998	1772							18	262	61	332		
ITBS Comprehension NPR																				
ITBS Vocabulary NPR																				
ITBS Reading Total NPR																				
ITBS Comprehension IPR																				
ITBS Vocabulary IPR																				
ITBS Reading Total IPR																				

Spring, 2005	Students without Disabilities										Students with Disabilities									
	Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
PAT Rhyming	1859	2055	1742	1935							176	239	183	264						
PAT Deletion	1678	2055	1718	1933							146	239	169	264						
PAT Blending	1744	2053	1742	1935							152	239	171	264						
PAT Segmentation			1885	1935									210	264						
PAT Isolation			1864	1935									181	264						
PAT Substitution			1757	1935									170	264						
PAT Graphemes			1804	1934									162	263						
PAT Decoding			1706	1934									140	263						
BRI Fluency			977	1929	969	1870	788	1763					52	259	49	306	41	349		
BRI Comprehension			1149	1929	1204	1870	1468	1763					75	259	90	306	159	349		
ITBS Comprehension NPR							1216	1749	1323	1716							98	354	100	358
ITBS Vocabulary NPR							1208	1748	1178	1716							120	354	107	358
ITBS Reading Total NPR							1228	1749	1290	1716							100	354	98	358
ITBS Comprehension IPR							833	1749	924	1716							46	354	57	358
ITBS Vocabulary IPR							856	1749	818	1716							67	354	51	358
ITBS Reading Total IPR							872	1749	887	1716							52	354	50	358

Table 12. Results for Students With and Without Limited English Proficiency

FALL, 2005	Students Without Limited English Proficiency										Students With Limited English Proficiency									
	Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
PAT Rhyming	1336	2049	1632	1925							118	298	193	315						
PAT Deletion	1069	2049	1353	1925							60	298	151	315						
PAT Blending	1064	2049	1431	1925							95	298	191	315						
PAT Segmentation			1649	1925									237	315						
PAT Isolation			1489	1925									207	315						
PAT Substitution			1327	1925									173	315						
PAT Graphemes			1316	1924	1511	1904							178	316	228	312				
PAT Decoding			1174	1924	1383	1904							153	316	217	312				
BRI Fluency					755	1913	746	1830							86	310	83	274		
BRI Comprehension					472	1913	990	1830							32	310	69	274		
ITBS Comprehension NPR																				
ITBS Vocabulary NPR																				
ITBS Reading Total NPR																				
ITBS Comprehension IPR																				
ITBS Vocabulary IPR																				
ITBS Reading Total IPR																				

SPRING, 2005	Students Without Limited English Proficiency										Students With Limited English Proficiency									
	Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade K		Grade 1		Grade 2		Grade 3		Grade 4	
	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total	N	Total
PAT Rhyming	1789	1964	1699	1894							246	330	226	305						
PAT Deletion	1611	1964	1662	1894							213	330	225	303						
PAT Blending	1651	1963	1660	1894							245	329	253	305						
PAT Segmentation			1814	1894									281	305						
PAT Isolation			1769	1894									276	305						
PAT Substitution			1674	1894									253	305						
PAT Graphemes			1705	1893									261	304						
PAT Decoding			1599	1893									247	304						
BRI Fluency			907	1883	898	1864	746	1841					122	305	120	312	83	271		
BRI Comprehension			1107	1883	1151	1864	1460	1841					117	305	143	312	167	271		
ITBS Comprehension NPR							1187	1831	1288	1805							127	272	135	269
ITBS Vocabulary NPR							1211	1831	1199	1805							117	271	86	269
ITBS Reading Total NPR							1202	1831	1268	1805							126	272	120	269
ITBS Comprehension IPR							815	1831	917	1805							64	272	64	269
ITBS Vocabulary IPR							863	1831	829	1805							60	272	40	269
ITBS Reading Total IPR							859	1831	891	1805							65	272	46	269

Table 13. Special Education Data (2003-2004 and 2004-2005)

School Year: 2004 Semester: Spring Created On: 2005-11-17						
Grade	Students Currently Receiving Special Education Services		Percentage of Students Referred for Pre-referral services		Students Placed in Special Education Services	
	N	Total	N	% Referred	N	% Placed
K	238	2382	100	4	39	2
1	239	2325	118	5	47	2
2	294	2242	121	5	39	2
3	323	2292	86	4	26	1
4	359	2300	75	3	7	0

School Year: 2005 Semester: Spring Created On: 2005-11-17						
Grade	Students Currently Receiving Special Education Services		Percentage of Students Referred for Pre-referral services		Students Placed in Special Education Services	
	N	Total	N	% Referred	N	% Placed
K	236	2212	78	4	19	1
1	264	2134	130	6	56	3
2	291	2119	160	8	69	3
3	341	2063	140	7	62	3
4	356	2070	105	5	40	2

References

- Hoover, H., Dunbar, S., Frisbie, D., Oberley, K., Bray, R., Naylor, J., Lewis, J., Ordman, V., & Qualls, A.L., (2003). *The Iowa Tests: Interpretive Guide for School Administrators*. Riverside, CA: Riverside Publishing.
- Johns, J. (2001). *Basic Reading Inventory: Pre-primer through grade twelve and early literacy assessments*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Robertson, C. & Salter, W. (1997). *The Phonological Awareness Test*. East Moline, IL: LinguSystems, Inc.